

Exhibit D

Courtney Mosuly

From: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 5:15 PM
To: Aamir Kazi; Corby Vowell; Jon Suder; Mike Cooke; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Michael J. Farnan
Cc: McAfee/Kajeet
Subject: RE: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

Aamir-

Kajeet's position is that by providing complete file paths for folders containing source code files, and requesting that all files in each such folder be produced, that Kajeet has specifically identified the portions of the code that it would like produced in hard copy. Your initial response email confirmed that this methodology for identifying the code requested is sufficient, as it mentioned that you had already reviewed our request and accessed all of the files Kajeet specifically requested. You then objected, without basis, to the number of files requested as being excessive. The record is clear on this. Your statement that there are no specific files that Kajeet is willing to identify is plainly false.

Because no agreement was reached on our call, we expect that McAfee will formally object to Kajeet's request with the Court within the 10-day period from your raising McAfee's objections, as set out in the Protective Order. Again, the 10-day period commenced with your August 31, 2021 email which stated McAfee's objections to Kajeet's request. I understand that you intend to take the position that McAfee did not make its objections on August 31st but, instead, did so two days later (on the last day permitted under the Protective Order) so as to purportedly extend your filing deadline to September 12, 2021. We disagree and will argue that your objections are untimely made, and therefore waived, if not submitted to the Court by this Friday, September 10th.

At this point, the issues have been discussed and both sides understand the positions of the other. The dispute is ripe for Court intervention. There is no need for continued discussion among counsel. The only live aspect of the dispute that potentially remains for discussion is whether the parties can agree to an expedited schedule for response/reply briefs, to the extent they are permitted for discovery disputes. I have not yet spoken with my local counsel about this but will soon, and will follow up with a proposal for expedited briefing, if appropriate.

Thanks,
Richard A. Wojcio, Jr.
Attorney at Law

F | S | C
FRIEDMAN SUDER & COOKE
604 East 4th Street, Suite 200 | Fort Worth, Texas 76102
Direct: 817-574-7012 | Main: 817.334.0400 | Fax: 817.334.0401
Email: wojcio@fsclaw.com | Website: www.fsclaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended as a private, confidential communication between or among the parties identified in the heading and may be legally privileged. If you've gotten this by mistake, please delete it from your system immediately. Unintended transmission does not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or other privilege.

Unless expressly stated, nothing in this message should be construed as a digital or e-signature, nor does it reflect an intent to make an agreement electronically.

IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication (including all information in this communication and any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be or may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information and/or communication. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, distribution, redistribution, transmission, retransmission, forwarding, circulation, publication, copying, printing and/or any other use of this email communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not an intended and addressed recipient or you have otherwise received this email communication in error, please contact the sender by reply

email or by phone immediately and permanently delete this email communication and all attachments. Thank you.

From: Aamir Kazi <kazi@fr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 3:04 PM
To: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>; Corby Vowell <vowell@fsclaw.com>; Jon Suder <jts@fsclaw.com>; Mike Cooke <mtc@fsclaw.com>; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Michael J. Farnan <mfarnan@farnanlaw.com>
Cc: McAfee/Kajeet <McAfee/Kajeet@fr.com>
Subject: RE: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

Hi Rich,

I wanted to follow up on our discussion yesterday regarding source code. As it stands, I understand that there are no specific files or portions of code in those directories that Kajeet is willing to identify to McAfee. I know the focus of yesterday's meet and confer was intended to be Kajeet's discovery responses, so to the extent Kajeet has further considered McAfee's request for more specificity in Kajeet's print requests, please let us know.

Thank you.

Aamir Kazi :: Principal :: Fish & Richardson P.C.
404 724 2811 direct :: kazi@fr.com

From: Aamir Kazi <kazi@fr.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 02, 2021 2:42 PM
To: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>; Corby Vowell <vowell@fsclaw.com>; Jon Suder <jts@fsclaw.com>; Mike Cooke <mtc@fsclaw.com>; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Michael J. Farnan <mfarnan@farnanlaw.com>
Cc: McAfee/Kajeet <McAfee/Kajeet@fr.com>
Subject: RE: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

Hi Rich –

Kajeet did not respond to my email below requesting a meet and confer nor have I heard from you. In the interest of moving this forward, McAfee will produce the specific files that Kajeet identified, and expects to produce those files today.

However, we would like to discuss the remainder of Kajeet's print request. Due to the way that Kajeet identified entire folders (without identifying specific files in those folders), our initial identification of pages below is incorrect. We do not believe that type of identification is compliant the protective order, but we are working to try to understand it to see if McAfee can accommodate Kajeet's request. We expect that the total number of pages in that aspect of the request is actually lower. But it probably makes sense for the parties to discuss first, so we can confirm we are on the same page.

Finally, because your email makes assumptions and statements that are wrong, we need to make sure to correct the record. First, McAfee has not "refused" to produce documents. Kajeet of course knows this, as we had a conference with Mr. Vowell earlier this week and he memorialized his understanding of that conference in email last night. We can only assume that Kajeet continues to include this misrepresentation in every email it sends in an attempt to build an incorrect record. Second, your speculation about the basis for McAfee's position is also untrue. In the future, please refrain from including such false statements and speculation as it is not productive.

Please feel free to give me a call if you would like to discuss.

Thank you.

Aamir Kazi :: Principal :: Fish & Richardson P.C.

404 724 2811 direct :: kazi@fr.com

From: Aamir Kazi <kazi@fr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2021 3:52 PM

To: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>; Corby Vowell <vowell@fsclaw.com>; Susana M. Ricardo <Ricardo@fr.com>; Jon Suder <jts@fsclaw.com>; Mike Cooke <mtc@fsclaw.com>; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Christopher O. Green <cgreen@fr.com>; Susan Morrison <morrison@fr.com>; Michael J. Farnan <mfarnan@farnanlaw.com>

Cc: McAfee/Kajeet <McAfee/Kajeet@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

Hi Rich –

Your email contains a series of inaccurate assumptions and statements. It is probably more productive to have a call to discuss. We are generally free tomorrow. Please let us know a time that works.

Thank you.

Aamir Kazi :: Principal :: Fish & Richardson P.C.

404 724 2811 direct :: kazi@fr.com

From: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2021 7:06 PM

To: Aamir Kazi <kazi@fr.com>; Corby Vowell <vowell@fsclaw.com>; Susana M. Ricardo <Ricardo@fr.com>; Jon Suder <jts@fsclaw.com>; Mike Cooke <mtc@fsclaw.com>; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Christopher O. Green <cgreen@fr.com>; Susan Morrison <morrison@fr.com>; Michael J. Farnan <mfarnan@farnanlaw.com>

Cc: McAfee/Kajeet <McAfee/Kajeet@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

Aamir-

Kajeet disagrees with your assertions that Kajeet's source code requests are "quite excessive." The source code for the accused products comprises thousands of files, of which Kajeet has requested only 85, per your count. This is hardly excessive, especially in light of McAfee's refusal to produce any further technical documentation describing the architecture and operation of the accused products to date. With regard to the directory entries, it appears you were able to find those directories within the source code and the files contained therein without difficulty. As such each has been identified in a sufficiently specific manner.

Kajeet's requests are made at the direction of its technical expert who inspected the code at your offices last week. His identification of the requested modules as being of particular importance provides good cause for Kajeet's request. It appears McAfee's responsive assertion that the requests are "excessive" or potentially irrelevant appears to be based solely on attorney opinion with no indication that the portions of the code requested have even been inspected ahead of making the present objection. Please let us know if this is incorrect.

If McAfee is refusing to produce any or all of the requested files, please let us know which specific files it is objecting to and the specific basis for each objection. Per the protective order, it is incumbent on the objecting party (McAfee) to raise its objections with the Court within ten days. To the extent there are files that McAfee does not object to producing, please identify those files and let us know whether they will be produced within the four day period contemplated by the Protective Order.

I am generally available tomorrow morning to discuss this matter further, if necessary. Let me know some times that work for you.

Thanks,

Richard A. Wojcio, Jr.
Attorney at Law

F | S | C

FRIEDMAN SUDER & COOKE

604 East 4th Street, Suite 200 | Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Direct: 817-574-7012 | Main: 817.334.0400 | Fax: 817.334.0401

Email: wojcio@fsclaw.com | Website: www.fsclaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended as a private, confidential communication between or among the parties identified in the heading and may be legally privileged. If you've gotten this by mistake, please delete it from your system immediately. Unintended transmission does not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or other privilege.

Unless expressly stated, nothing in this message should be construed as a digital or e-signature, nor does it reflect an intent to make an agreement electronically.

IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication (including all information in this communication and any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be or may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information and/or communication. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, distribution, redistribution, transmission, retransmission, forwarding, circulation, publication, copying, printing and/or any other use of this email communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not an intended and addressed recipient or you have otherwise received this email communication in error, please contact the sender by reply email or by phone immediately and permanently delete this email communication and all attachments. Thank you.

From: Aamir Kazi <kazi@fr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2021 2:39 PM

To: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>; Corby Vowell <vowell@fsclaw.com>; Susana M. Ricardo <Ricardo@fr.com>; Jon Suder <jts@fsclaw.com>; Mike Cooke <mtc@fsclaw.com>; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Christopher O. Green <cgreen@fr.com>; Susan Morrison <morrison@fr.com>; Michael J. Farnan <mfarnan@farnanlaw.com>

Cc: McAfee/Kajeet <McAfee/Kajeet@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

Rich,

We have now had an opportunity to investigate Kajeet's print request. Kajeet's request seems quite excessive, as Kajeet has requested that McAfee print nearly 1200 pages of code from 85 different files. Included in Kajeet's request is a request to print 8 directories entirely, several of which have 20+ files within them, without any effort to identify specific files in those directories. Is it really Kajeet's position that every single file in each of those directories is relevant? That does not seem plausible.

We would like to find a way to work with Kajeet here, but it looks like Kajeet did not make any effort to narrowly tailor its print request in this case, and it is not reasonable to print this much code indiscriminately.

Are you available to discuss?

Thank you.

Aamir Kazi :: Principal :: Fish & Richardson P.C.

404 724 2811 direct :: kazi@fr.com

From: Rich Wojcio <wojcio@fsclaw.com>

Sent: Friday, August 27, 2021 5:27 PM

To: Aamir Kazi <kazi@fr.com>; Corby Vowell <vowell@fsclaw.com>; Susana M. Ricardo <Ricardo@fr.com>; Jon Suder <jts@fsclaw.com>; Mike Cooke <mtc@fsclaw.com>; bfarnan@farnanlaw.com; Christopher O. Green <cgreen@fr.com>; Susan Morrison <morrison@fr.com>; Michael J. Farnan <mfarnan@farnanlaw.com>

Cc: McAfee/Kajeet <McAfee/Kajeet@fr.com>

Subject: Kajeet v. McAfee - Request for Source Code

[This email originated outside of F&R.]

Aamir,

Pursuant to the provisions of Paragraph 10(g) of the Protective Order entered in this case [Dkt. No. 28], Kajeet hereby requests that the source code modules listed in the attached document be produced in hard copy. Some of the items listed are individual files while others are folder locations containing more than one file. For all folder requests, Kajeet is requesting that each file contained in the identified folder be produced. In light of McAfee's producing only 22 pages of core technical documents in this case, we expect that there will be no objection from McAfee as to the reasonableness of the number of files and total pages of source code requested. Please let us know if McAfee disagrees. Please also confirm that McAfee will provide the requested documents within four business days, as the Protective Order requires. Kajeet reserves the right to make additional requests for hard copy production of source code as the case progresses.

Kajeet expects to continue its ongoing inspection of McAfee's source code, pursuant to Paragraph 10(a) of the Protective Order, in the upcoming weeks. We are coordinating with our technical expert to identify dates that are workable on our end to continue the inspection. I will follow up with firm dates once they are known. We expect that during this next inspection McAfee will have had sufficient time to now produce the source code in accordance with the requirements of the Protective Order, including providing two laptops with the source code and requested additional software (Eclipse, NetBeans) for review and an additional laptop for note taking.

Thank you,

Richard A. Wojcio, Jr.

Attorney at Law

F | S | C

FRIEDMAN SUDER & COOKE

604 East 4th Street, Suite 200 | Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Direct: 817-574-7012 | Main: 817.334.0400 | Fax: 817.334.0401

Email: wojcio@fsclaw.com | Website: www.fsclaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended as a private, confidential communication between or among the parties identified in the heading and may be legally privileged. If you've gotten this by mistake, please delete it from your system immediately. Unintended transmission does not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or other privilege.

Unless expressly stated, nothing in this message should be construed as a digital or e-signature, nor does it reflect an intent to make an agreement electronically.

IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication (including all information in this communication and any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be or may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information and/or communication. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, distribution, redistribution, transmission, retransmission, forwarding, circulation, publication, copying, printing and/or any other use of this email communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not an intended and addressed recipient or you have otherwise received this email communication in error, please contact the sender by reply email or by phone immediately and permanently delete this email communication and all attachments. Thank you.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

